BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE

Mary Landson
Expecutive Secretory

IN DISCIPLINARY DISTRICT VII OF THE BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE

IN RE: JACQUES B. GLASSMAN,

BPR #4174, Respondent An Attorney Licensed and Admitted to the Practice of

Law in Tennessee (Madison County)

DOCKET NO. 2006-1609-7-SG

JUDGMENT OF HEARING PANEL

This cause came on to be heard by the Hearing Panel of the Board of Professional Responsibility of the Supreme Court of Tennessee on December 4, 2007, pursuant to Rule 9, Rules of the Supreme Court of Tennessee. This Hearing Panel, Phillip Gordon Hollis, Chair, William Boyette Denton, and Jerry P. Spore make the following findings of fact and submit its judgment in this cause.

I.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On June 23, 2005, the Board of Professional Responsibility filed a Petition for Discipline to which the Respondent filed an Answer on July 12, 2005. On September 18, 2006,

the Board filed a Supplemental Petition for Discipline which was answered on February 13, 2007. On January 26, 2007, the Board filed a Second Supplemental Petition for Discipline which was answered February 13, 2007. Thereafter, on October 30, 2007, the Board filed a Third Supplemental Petition for Discipline which was answered November 12, 2007. The hearing on the various Petitions was held December 4, 2007.

Π.

The following Findings are based on the Petition and Supplemental Petitions, the Answers thereto, the proof introduced at the hearing, the remarks of counsel and the entire record from all of which the Hearing Panel finds and concludes:

- The Board of Professional Responsibility has carried its burden of proof and the charges in the Petition for Discipline, Supplemental Petition for Discipline; Second Supplemental Petition for Discipline and Third Supplemental Petition for Discipline are correct.
- 2. The Respondent accepted fees to handle matters he was incompetent to handle and/or failed to handle effectively in violation of Rules 1.1; 1.3; 1.5; 3.2 and 8.4 of the Tennessee Rules of Professional Conduct.
- 3. The Respondent failed to adequately communicate with clients in violation of Rules 1.4 and 8.4 of the Tennessee Rules of Professional Conduct.

- 4. The Respondent made misrepresentations to clients and to the Board of Professional Responsibility in violation of Rules 1.4; 8.2 and 8.4 of the Tennessee Rules of Professional Conduct.
- 5. The Respondent's prior discipline consisting of a November 12, 2001 Private Informal Admonition; a May 3, 2004 Public Censure; a July 16, 2004 Private Informal Admonition; an August 1, 2005 Private Reprimand and an October 13, 2005 Public Censure are aggravating circumstances justifying an increase in the discipline to be imposed against the Respondent.

Therefore, based upon the testimony and evidence presented, this Hearing Panel recommends:

- 1. The Respondent be suspended for one (1) year; and
- 2. If reinstated after his one (1) year suspension, the Respondent shall be on probation for two (2) years with the following conditions:
 - A. The Respondent shall not violate the Tennessee Rules of Professional

 Conduct; and
 - B. A practice monitor agreed to by the Respondent and Disciplinary Counsel for the Board of Professional Responsibility who shall:

117

pt Rhll -- perm 12-31-07

- a. Communicate with the Respondent at least once a week;
- b. Meet with the Respondent at least once a month;
- c. File monthly reports to the Board of Professional Responsibility regarding the Respondent's practice and the Respondent's compliance with the Tennessee Rules of Professional Conduct.

Phillip Gordon Hollis, Chair

William Boyette Denton

Jerry P. Spore